Amendment Dated: May 4, 2007

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Claim 1 (currently amended): A method for scheduling a plurality of tasks in a processing system having a plurality of defined resources, comprising:

identifying prerequisites for each task, the prerequisites representing all defined resources needed for that task to execute to completion;

identifying one or more higher priority task paths and one or more lower priority task paths, each of the paths having a plurality of tasks in series;

in a task priority order determined in accordance with the higher priority task paths and the lower priority task paths, comparing the prerequisites for a particular task against a system state representing a current state of the defined resources until a task is identified for which the comparison reveals that the prerequisites for the identified task are currently available; and dispatching the identified task.

Claim 2 (currently amended): The method as recited in claim 1, further comprising:

identifying one or more priority task paths in a task processing sequence; and

arranging the task priority order such that the tasks in the priority task paths have a higher priority than other tasks.

Claim 3 (original): The method as recited in claim 1, further comprising: identifying one or more fast paths in a task processing sequence; and for a given fast path, arranging the task priority order such that the tasks in the given fast path have a higher priority than other tasks.

Claim 4 (original): The method as recited in claim 3, further comprising: identifying a processing order of the tasks in the given fast path; and arranging the task priority order such that a last task in the given fast path has a higher priority than a first task in the given fast path.

Claim 5 (original): The method as recited in claim 3, further comprising: identifying a processing order of the tasks in the given fast path; and arranging the task priority order such that a first task in the given fast path has a higher priority than a last task in the given fast path.

Claim 6 (original): The method as recited in claim 1, further comprising representing each defined resource by one or more resource flags that provide information about that resource.

Claim 7 (original): The method as recited in claim 6, further comprising storing the prerequisites for each task as a collection of resource flags known as a prerequisite row and storing the system state as a collection of resource flags.

Claim 8 (original): The method as recited in claim 7, further comprising comparing the prerequisite row for the particular task against the system state by performing a Boolean AND of the prerequisite row and the system state.

Claim 9 (original): The method as recited in claim 7, further comprising:

creating a prerequisite table, the prerequisite table having one prerequisite row for each instantiated task arranged in descending order according to the task priority order, and having one column for each resource flag; and

in a descending row order, performing a comparison of the prerequisite row for the task in a given row against the system state.

Claim 10 (original): The method as recited in claim 9, further comprising:

creating a decision tree from the prerequisite table according to the task priority order, the decision tree having one leaf for each instantiated task, one node for each resource, and one edge for each resource flag; and

traversing the decision tree in accordance with the availability of resources.

Claim 11 (original): The method as recited in claim 1, further comprising updating the system state after resources are actually used.

4

Claim 12 (original): The method as recited in claim 11, wherein after the system state has been updated, the method further comprises implementing fair-share scheduling by resuming the comparison of prerequisite rows against the updated system state at a next row in the prerequisite table.

Claim 13 (original): The method as recited in claim 11, wherein once the system state has been updated, the method further comprises implementing priority scheduling by resuming the comparison of prerequisite rows against the updated system state at a first row in the prerequisite table.

Claim 14 (original): The method as recited in claim 11, further comprising: grouping consecutive prerequisite rows in the prerequisite table into one or more blocks; when a task is identified and scheduled for dispatch, identifying the block to which the identified task belongs; and

once the identified task is dispatched and the system state is updated, resuming the comparison at a next row within the identified block, or resuming the comparison at a first row of the prerequisite table if the dispatched task was a last task in the identified block.

Claim 15 (currently amended): The method as recited in claim 1, further comprising: creating one or more priority flags representing various priority levels as defined priority flag resources in the processing system; and

adding the priority flag resources to the prerequisites of selected tasks in accordance with priority levels desired for those tasks;

wherein the priority flag resources effectively change the task priority order as the prerequisites for the selected tasks are compared against the system state.

Application No.: 10/817,290 Amendment Dated: May 4, 2007

Claim 16 (original): The method as recited in claim 1, the defined resources including one or more queues, the method further comprising:

changing a depth of one or more queues to alter the scheduling of tasks having those queues as prerequisites.

Claim 17 (original): The method as recited in claim 1, the defined resources including one or more buffer pools, the method further comprising:

changing a depth of one or more buffer pools to alter the scheduling of tasks having those buffer pools as prerequisites.

Claim 18 (original): The method as recited in claim 9, further comprising:

storing the prerequisite rows in M N-bit words, each bit in each N-bit word representing a resource flag and each resource flag being either asserted to indicate that the resource flag is a prerequisite of the task represented by the prerequisite row or deasserted to indicate that the resource flag is not a prerequisite of that task;

storing the system state in M N-bit words, each bit in each N-bit word representing a resource flag, each resource flag being either asserted or deasserted in accordance with the current state of the processing system;

storing an indicator of the last N-bit word containing an asserted resource flag;

comparing the prerequisites and the system state of successive N-bit words only up to the last N-bit word containing an asserted resource flag; and

determining whether the prerequisites for the identified task are currently available using only the compared N-bit words.

Claim 19 (original): The method as recited in claim 18, further comprising:

arranging the resource flags that make up the prerequisite rows and the system state so that when the prerequisite rows are stored in the M-bit words, the number of asserted resource flags appearing in the first M-bit word is maximized.

Docket No.: 491442003100

Application No.: 10/817,290 Amendment Dated: May 4, 2007

Claim 20 (original): The method as recited in claim 9, further comprising:

storing the prerequisite rows in M N-bit words, each bit in each N-bit word representing a resource flag, each resource flag being either asserted to indicate that the resource flag is a prerequisite of the task represented by the prerequisite row or deasserted to indicate that the resource flag is not a prerequisite of that task;

storing the system state in M N-bit words, each bit in each N-bit word representing a resource flag, each resource flag being either asserted or deasserted in accordance with the current state of the processing system;

comparing the prerequisites and the system state of successive N-bit words only as long as the comparison indicates that the prerequisites for the identified task are currently available.

Claim 21 (original): The method as recited in claim 2, further comprising: modifying a scope of the prerequisites for the tasks in a particular priority task path to adjust a processing speed of that priority task path.

Claim 22 (currently amended): In a processing system having a plurality of defined resources, the processing system for executing a plurality of tasks, a computer program for scheduling the plurality of tasks, the computer program being stored on a machine readable medium and executable to perform acts comprising:

identifying prerequisites for each task, the prerequisites representing all defined resources needed for that task to execute to completion;

identifying one or more higher priority task paths and one or more lower priority task paths, each of the paths having a plurality of tasks in series;

in a task priority order <u>determined in accordance with the higher priority task paths and the lower priority task paths</u>, comparing the prerequisites for a particular task against a system state representing a current state of the defined resources until a task is identified for which the comparison reveals that the prerequisites for the identified task are currently available; and scheduling the identified task for dispatch.

Docket No.: 491442003100

7

Application No.: 10/817,290 Amendment Dated: May 4, 2007

Claim 23 (currently amended): The computer program as recited in claim 22, further executable to perform acts comprising:

identifying one or more priority task paths in a task processing sequence; and arranging the task priority order such that the tasks in the priority task paths have a higher priority than other tasks.

Claim 24 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 22, further executable to perform acts comprising:

identifying one or more fast paths in a task processing sequence; and

for a given fast path, arranging the task priority order such that the tasks in the given fast path have a higher priority than other tasks.

Claim 25 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 24, further executable to perform acts comprising:

identifying a processing order of the tasks in the given fast path; and arranging the task priority order such that a last task in the given fast path has a higher priority than a first task in the given fast path.

Claim 26 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 24, further executable to perform acts comprising:

identifying a processing order of the tasks in the given fast path; and arranging the task priority order such that a first task in the given fast path has a higher priority than a last task in the given fast path.

Claim 27 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 22, further executable to perform acts comprising representing each defined resource by one or more resource flags that provide information about that resource.

Claim 28 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 27, further executable to perform acts comprising storing the prerequisites for each task as a collection of resource flags known as a prerequisite row and storing the system state as a collection of resource flags.

8

Claim 29 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 28, further executable to perform acts comprising comparing the prerequisite row for the particular task against the system state by performing a Boolean AND of the prerequisite row and the system state.

Claim 30 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 28, further executable to perform acts comprising:

creating a prerequisite table, the prerequisite table having one prerequisite row for each instantiated task arranged in descending order according to the task priority order, and having one column for each resource flag; and

in a descending row order, performing a comparison of the prerequisite row for the task in a given row against the system state.

Claim 31 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 30, further executable to perform acts comprising:

creating a decision tree from the prerequisite table according to the task priority order, the decision tree having one leaf for each instantiated task, one node for each resource, and one edge for each resource flag; and

traversing the decision tree in accordance with the availability of resources.

Claim 32 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 22, further executable to perform acts comprising updating the system state as resources are actually used.

Claim 33 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 32, wherein after the system state has been updated, the computer program is further executable to perform acts comprising fair-share scheduling by resuming the comparison of prerequisite rows against the updated system state at a next row in the prerequisite table.

9

Claim 34 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 32, wherein once the system state has been updated, the computer program is further executable to perform acts comprising priority scheduling by resuming the comparison of prerequisite rows against the updated system state at a first row in the prerequisite table.

Claim 35 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 32, further executable to perform acts comprising:

grouping consecutive prerequisite rows in the prerequisite table into one or more blocks; when a task is identified and scheduled for dispatch, identifying the block to which the identified task belongs; and

once the identified task is dispatched and the system state is updated, resuming the comparison at a next row within the identified block, or resuming the comparison at a first row of the prerequisite table if the dispatched task was a last task in the identified block.

Claim 36 (currently amended): The computer program as recited in claim 22, further executable to perform acts comprising:

creating one or more priority flags representing various priority levels as defined <u>priority flag</u> resources in the processing system; and

adding the priority flag resources to the prerequisites of selected tasks in accordance with priority levels desired for those tasks;

wherein the priority flag resources effectively change the task priority order as the prerequisites for the selected tasks are compared against the system state.

Application No.: 10/817,290 Amendment Dated: May 4, 2007

Claim 37 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 22, the defined resources including one or more queues, the computer program further executable to perform acts comprising: changing a depth of one or more queues to alter the scheduling of tasks having those queues as prerequisites.

Claim 38 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 22, the defined resources including one or more buffer pools, the computer program further executable to perform acts comprising:

changing a depth of one or more buffer pools to alter the scheduling of tasks having those buffer pools as prerequisites.

Claim 39 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 30, further executable to perform acts comprising:

storing the prerequisite rows in M N-bit words, each bit in each N-bit word representing a resource flag and each resource flag being either asserted to indicate that the resource flag is a prerequisite of the task represented by the prerequisite row or deasserted to indicate that the resource flag is not a prerequisite of that task;

storing the system state in M N-bit words, each bit in each N-bit word representing a resource flag, each resource flag being either asserted or deasserted in accordance with the current state of the processing system;

storing an indicator of the last N-bit word containing an asserted resource flag;

comparing the prerequisites and the system state of successive N-bit words only up to the last N-bit word containing an asserted resource flag; and

determining whether the prerequisites for the identified task are currently available using only the compared N-bit words.

Docket No.: 491442003100

Claim 40 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 39, further executable to perform acts comprising:

arranging the resource flags that make up the prerequisite rows and the system state so that when the prerequisite rows are stored in the M-bit words, the number of asserted resource flags appearing in the first M-bit word is maximized.

Claim 41 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 30, further executable to perform acts comprising:

storing the prerequisite rows in M N-bit words, each bit in each N-bit word representing a resource flag, each resource flag being either asserted to indicate that the resource flag is a prerequisite of the task represented by the prerequisite row or deasserted to indicate that the resource flag is not a prerequisite of that task;

storing the system state in M N-bit words, each bit in each N-bit word representing a resource flag, each resource flag being either asserted or deasserted in accordance with the current state of the processing system;

comparing the prerequisites and the system state of successive N-bit words only as long as the comparison indicates that the prerequisites for the identified task are currently available.

Claim 42 (original): The computer program as recited in claim 23, further executable to perform acts comprising:

modifying a scope of the prerequisites for the tasks in a particular priority task path to adjust a processing speed of that priority task path.

Claim 43 (original): A host bus adapter (HBA) comprising the machine readable medium of claim 22.

Claim 44 (original): The HBA of claim 43, further comprising an Internet Small Computer System Interface (iSCSI) or fibre channel (FC) controller circuit.

Amendment Dated: May 4, 2007

Claim 45 (original): A host computer comprising the HBA of claim 44.

Claim 46 (original): A storage area network (SAN) comprising the host computer of claim 45, wherein an iSCSI or a FC network is coupled to the iSCSI or FC controller circuit, respectively, and one or more storage devices are coupled to the iSCSI or FC network.